

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/774,041	02/06/2004	Fufang Zha	2002P87049WOUS	4995	
7590 01/23/2007 SIEMENS CORPORATION INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT			EXAMINER		
			MENON, KRISHNAN S		
170 WOOD A' ISELIN, NJ 08	VENUE SOUTH 830	•	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
	·	•	1723		
	,		MẠIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/23/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	10/774,041	ZHA ET AL.					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Krishnan S. Menon	1723					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 January 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) A The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire! Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.					
1. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).							
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affidav	it or other evidence is	necessary and				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appear y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but so attached OA	nt does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:				
see attached OA 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
•		Krishnan S Menon Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1723					

Art Unit: 1723

Advisory Action

Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Argument that the Sunaoka reference teaches a two-stage process for cleaning is not commensurate in scope with the claims.

Argument that Sunaoka does not teach closing the valve before pressurizing with compressed air: applicant's claim 1 is for dislodging the liquid containing the contaminants form the vessel, which is also the stated purpose of the reference. Since the reference does not specifically say whether the drain valve was closed or open before pressurizing, the rejection was made 102/103. One would expect the drain valve to be closed at the time of pressurizing because normally a drain valve would be kept closed; and one would open the valve only when ready to drain. However, if the reference were to be construed as teaching that the drain valve be opened before pressurizing, then keeping the drain valve closed before pressurizing would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Argument about Sunaoka's concern about membrane damage due to pressure is not convincing because the reference teaches pressurizing with compressed air.

With respect to the Beck reference, as stated in the rejection, even if pressurizing is on the lumen side, the highly-permeable membrane would equalize pressure on both sides of the membrane and thus would inherently create a gas-filled region (however small such a gas filled region be) on the feed side, which would be as claimed by the applicant. Argument that the fluid is incompressible is not convincing; any headspace or air pocket in the feed side would be sufficient to form the pressurized gas-containing

Art Unit: 1723

region. Opening the drain after pressurizing the lumen of the hollow fibers would make the contents of the tank to flow out through the drain at a much faster rate even if no gas-containing region is formed at the feed side because of the high permeability of the membrane.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krishnan S. Menon whose telephone number is 571-272-1143. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda L. Walker can be reached on 571-272-1151. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Krishnan S Menon Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1723